REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are pending. Claims 1-27 are rejected. Reconsideration of the Claims is respectfully requested.

102 Rejection

Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Du et al. (US Patent No. 6,308,636). Applicants respectfully submit that the Du et al. reference does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the present invention as are set forth in Claims 1-27.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to Claim 1 which is drawn to a method of assigning resources to nodes in a workflow. Claim 1 is reproduced in its entirety for the Examiner's convenience below:

1. A method of assigning resources to nodes in a workflow comprising:

defining a plurality of nodes, wherein said nodes are tasks to be executed within said workflow; defining said resources for execution of said nodes; storing a set of data items having variables pertaining to execution of said workflow; and assigning said resources to said nodes for execution thereof in accordance with a set of rules, said set of rules for controlling the execution of said workflow.

Claims 10 and 19 recite limitations similar to those contained in Claim 1. Claims 2-9 depend from independent Claim 1, Claims 11-18 depend from independent Claim 10 and Claims 20-27 depend from independent Claim 19. These Claims recite additional limitations of embodiments of the present claimed invention.

10010315-1 Examiner: Ali, S. J. Applicants respectfully submit that Du et al. does not anticipate or render obvious a method of assigning resources to nodes (tasks) in a workflow that includes defining a plurality of tasks to be executed within the workflow and "assigning said resources to said nodes for execution thereof in accordance with a set of rules, said set of rules for controlling the execution of said workflow" as is recited in Claim 1 (Claims 10 and 19 contain similar limitations). Applicants respectfully submit that Du et al. only discloses a dissimilar system and method for enterprise workflow resource management. Du et al. is concerned with the structure of a resource management layer and the interaction among its constituent components. It should be appreciated that Du et al. does not focus on the manner in which resources are assigned and certainly does not teach or suggest that as a part of a resource assignment process itself: (1) a plurality of task are defined (as opposed to being defined beforehand), (2) resources for execution of the task are defined and (3) resources are assigned to these tasks according to a set of rules for controlling the execution of the workflow.

In fact, Applicants respectfully submit that nowhere in the Du et al. reference is a method of assigning resources to nodes (tasks) in a workflow that includes defining a plurality of tasks to be executed within the workflow and assigning the resources to nodes for execution thereof in accordance with a set of rules taught or suggested as is set forth in Claims 1, 10 and 19. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present claimed invention that are set forth in Claims 1, 10 and 19 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Du et al.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 10 and 19 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). Moreover, Applicants also respectfully submit that Du et al. does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the present claimed invention as are set forth in Claims 2-9 which depend from Claim 1, Claims 11-18 which depend from

10010315-1 Serial No.: 10/032,893 Examiner: Ali, S. J. 3 Group Art Unit: 2195 Claim 10 and Claims 20-27 which depend from Claim 19. Consequently, these Claims likewise overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being dependent on allowable base claims.

Conclusion

In light of the above-listed amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the remaining Claims.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: 4/7, 2005

John P. Wagner, Jr. Registration No. 35,398 Two North Market Street Third Floor San Jose, CA 95113 (408) 938-9060

10010315-1 Examiner: Ali, S. J. Serial No.: 10/032,893 Group Art Unit: 2195